Certaine briefe

OBSERUATIONS AND ANTIQUÆRIES:

ON

Maſter *Prin* his Twelve queſtions about Church-Governement.

WHEREIN

is modeſtly ſhewed, how un-uſefull and frivolous they are; How bitter and unchriſtian in cenſuring that way; Whereas there are no Reaſons brought to contradict it.

By a VVell-VViſher to the Truth, and Maſter PRIN.

Printed in the yeer 1644.

Certain briefe Obſerva-

tions and Antiquæries on Mr. *Prin* his Tweleve Queſtions about Church-Governement.

THere is no ſight ſo lovely,& taking to the eyes of all ingenious and ſincere hearts, as naked truth; theſe which know its excellency will ſtudy to finde it out. Truth is a jewell which lies out of ſight, as it were, in the bowels of many reaſons, men muſt ſearch for it, that will finde it out, among truthes, this of Church-Government is not the leaſt. There are many things this age hath brought forth about it to litlte purpoſe; moſt men beating about the buſh; few that I have ſeen have diſcovered it in its nature. Some write ſo voluminous, heaping up ſo many diſtinctions about it, that they rather darken the truth then ſet it forth, rather intangle a mans underſtanding then in forme it; others write ſo full of paſſion, as if they writ with poiſon of Aſpes, reckoning up mens perſonall failling to diſgrace the Cauſe, not urging their arguments to convince the judgemen, (among theſe I have obſerved one Maſter *Edwvrds* hath the quickeſt pen, and I have often thought that book ſhould rather have been writ by Doctor, *Peclinton*, Doctor *Heylin*, or one of the Archbiſhops chaplaines, then Maſter *Edwards*, who hath been ſometimes accoun'ed godly.) Maſter PRIN. hath begun another way as unſatisfactory as any; though we hope there is more candor in his ſpirit: He profeſſeth in the biginning he hath not leaſure to debate the controverſie; and then its wondered why he propounds theſe *Queries*. For either, firſt hee layes them downe as poſitions undiſputeable, undeniable in reſepect of the clearneſſe of them

unto all underſtandings, or becauſe of his name to them; for elſe he knowes (as all know) that have any light in this controverſie, that all theſe grouds, theſe whom he call independents will deny, and their anſwer would bee negative to every one. Or ſecondly, he propounds them as affirmatives which hee intends to prove to cleere by ſolid argments, and then hee muſt have leaſure to do it; and as yet the others negation is as ſtrong as his affirmation, for here is no Proof for it. Or elſe thirdly, as conſiderations in which he deſires ſatisfaction as one being in doubt which way to walke, onely theſe things for the preſent move him to be of a contrary judgement; the ſtyle of the booke doth not much favour this laſt, as being too full of confidence, and bitterneſſe: If Maſter PRIN had ſuch a ſence of the publike diviſions, he would not have gone to make the breach wider by ſeting forth *Queries* ſtuft with ſuch invectives. I had thought ſufferings had learned Maſter PRIN a little meekneſſe; Maſter PRIN knowes his name is famous abroad, & that the common people will think that that muſt needs be true which he pleades for. Beſides, he knowes that the Reverend Aſſembly is now controverting of the thing, and that *Queries* will do little good while Arguments are expected on both ſides: but ſince they are out let us ſee what are in them.

THe ſum of the firſt *Querie*, is, whether christ hath ſet down in the Word any preſcript forme of government for Kingdome and Churches to follow, or whether (ſeeing there be different formes of civill governement in almaſt every Kingdome) there is not a latitude, and libertie left them by Chriſt to chuſe a government ſutable to their State.

If this were granted, what abſurdities would follw?

Anſwer. For the Goſpel would be ſtraiter then the Law, Chriſt more
Exod. 25. 40. unfaithfull then *Moſs*, God ſet a pattern to *Moſes*, which hee
Heb. 8 5. charged him not to vary from a tittle, that was but a carnall Temple in compariſon of this, nay it was a type of the Church under the Goſpell. Chriſt ſhould neither be faithfull as a Husband, Head, nor King of his Church, if he ſhould give others power to order it, to ſuit it as they peaſed to their owne civill governement, not ſetting down his own Lawes for them to walke by. In Revel. 11. 1, 2. you reade of a meaſuring of the Temple: Now how can you meaſure

measure without a rule? The meaning of that, according to Master *Prin*, must be thus (measured) that is, frme it according to your civill State, a miserable measure for a Church. In *Revel.* 20.1. its said the patterne of the new Jerusalem, (which is but the Church in her purest state, the same for forme with the former Church) came down from heave,

Besides, look in this *Querie* and you shall finde a contradiction, for he askes whether Church governement may not be framed to any civill State if it be consonant to the Word, and yet qustions whether there be any rule in the word.

Secondly, if no prescript forme in the Word, why not Episcopacie as well as Presbyterie? why such crying down of Bishops as Antichristian, for how can that be more Antichristian then any other, seeing there is no certain government in the Word? Episcopasie regulated and moderated (if all were known) is more consonant and agreeable to a Monarchcail government then Presbytery,

Thirdly, I aske of Master *Prin*, if Church governement must be suted to States, whether Politicians are not more fit to consult about stablishing it: And why is an assembly of Divines Called to to search the Word about it? Surely States men know better how to fit he Common-Wealth then Divines: there must be something in it, surely, or else the Parliament did very ill to have a Synod, If the Doctrine be true, throw aside the Bible, in this matter study the Law; and then it is well done of Master *Prin* to write of it, being his profession.

Fourthly, Whether Master *Prin* thinks it more reason that the State should be subject to Christs rule, or Christ to their direction; thathe Governement of his Church should be fitted to States, or thy to it. I know his religion, though his reason should stand a far off, would abhor the thought of it: if you, and the Presbyterians go on that principle, the Saints will hardly be of your judgment, for they think Christ is King alone over his Churches, and hath not left them to substitutes, and the politicke considerations of men for to governe them.

These two places you urge out of 1 Cor. 14. 40. and the 11. 34. where the Apostle speakes of doing *all things decently*, &c. is far from this, it being about things that are meerly circumstan-

tiall ordering of things in a Church already constituted, not of the constitution of any Church.

The second *Querie*, in some, is, whether if any government be established by any State upon serious debate, every one is not bound in conscience to submit to it, and no wayes to seek an exemption from it, under paine of being guilty of arrogancy, &c. The Scriptures in the margent, I wonder to what end Master *Prin* quotes them so little to purpose, look on that place 1. *Cor.* 14. 32, *The spirit of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets*; how full to the thing let all judge who know the scope of that place, by the Prophets there doth he meane the civill Sate or the Synod, or both? And is not that spoken to a particular congregation, for the regulating the exercise of propheſying; or doth he meane by being subject, that the Prophets have an authoritative power over the other Prophets; I know not what he meanes by that place. The other places, *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. of *submitting to every ordinance*, &c. If that be true, then every man is bound to put out his own eyes, to yeeld to blind obedience; never to search into the truth, for if he search and find it contrary to the Word, he must follow his judgment, and to follow his judgment is to be a Schismatick, to be guilty of arrogancy, &c. to contradict the Word, to oppose an ordinance of God; so that a man must inevitably sinne, take either part. Is not this to uphold the Papist tenent of beleeving as the Church beleeveth? &c. I put it to Master *Prin*, if the Parliament and Synod should set up an Epoſcopall government, which he thinks is Antichristian, whether he would not speake a word against it? Is not this a base bondage, *jurare in verba alterius*, to give up a mans faith and conscience to mens direction; but if the former be true, then this second must follow, if no rule, then you must obey what is commanded you. Suppose that is commanded may prove untrue, what if that way be not right, if that Synod and State should erre, what would you thinke of it then? &c.

Secondly, I humbly demand of Master *Prin* whether he and the other two holy men were not justly stigmatised and censured for speaking against the Bishops and Ceremonies? &c. which were stablished by so many Synods, and Acts of Parliament; and how he can excuse himselfe from pride and arrogancy in such

ſuch a courſe; for by his owne rule he ſhould have actually obeyed and not ſpake a word to the contrary. Such divinity will overthrow all the power of Scripture over mens conſciences, only make that to bind which a Synod thinks good,

The third *Querie* contradicts the firſt, in the firſt hee askes whether there be any rule in the Word; here hee askes whether that government which hath ſufficient, if not moſt warant in the new Teſtament is not to be choſen. In this he cries up the one government (which he inſtanceth inthe fourth *Querie* to bee Presbyteryall) as tending to eſtabliſh Chriſtian unity; peace &c. that which ſerves moſt effectually to prevent Hereſies, Schiſmes, &c. Here is a bare affirmation, and the independents. No, is as good as your, I. Its deſired Maſter *Prin* would prove what hee ſayes, that independent government hath not ſuch expreſſe warraut from the word (another contradiction) as presbyteriall; prove that, and you ſhall be *Magnus Apollo*; as for the Scriptures you bring will little help you.

For the fife, its anſwered by way of conceſſion, that it will overthrow all Nationall Churches, as not conceiving any ſuch warrant in the Word, but for any forme of civill government it will ſtand better with them then Presbytery can; the miſchiefes of Prysbytery, are vailed with Orthodoxneſſe, and preventing Schiſmes, &c. But if the Saints would pry into the formality, tyranny, inſlaving mens judgements and conſciences the Preſbyteriall way, &c. they would look upon it as that which is moſt inconſiſtent with their ſpirituall liberty, and with State priviledges. Its politickly done of you to put the beſt termes on your owne way how will you have it take elſe; I will let paſſe your bitter expreſſions (that one man would bee, if poſſible, a independent Church, and republicke ſubject to no lawes) I thought ſuch language would not ſuit with your ſpirit, Maſter *Prin* eſpecially that you would not ſpeake ſo of them, who were your beſt friends in your ſufferings; which ſtood to you, and refreſhed you, when moſt of your Presbyterians (Epiſcopall enough then) were ſhie of you, I could name men that uſed you kindly, whom you now implicitlyreproach; the independents give more to civill power then your presbyterians doe; I would faine know whether your Presbyterians doe not hold that

n this Quc
ie he quote
a ſaing in a
Book calle
The blood
Tenant,
which was
written by
one as contra
ry to this as
the independ-
dents, as he i
to the Presbi
terians and
they utterly

hat an Act of a Synod or a Nationall Assembly is as valid and binding in Ecclesiasticks, as an Act of Parliament in Civills; and whether the Parliament can *de jure* contradict their proceedings, whether they will affirme that the Parliament hath any jurisdiction over them in setling Ecclesiasticall matters, this is not a *Querie* without ground; for as far as the Independents understand of the Presbyteriall Government in Scotland, its absolutely Independent from the Parliament in respect of decreeing and inacting matters of governement; Onely this honour Presbyterians give to their Magistrate, they must be the executioners of their Judgements, to hang whom they condemne.

The sum of the sixth *Querie*, is, Whether since the first preaching the Gospell, beleevers multiplying they did not gather into Churches which had dependence on, and was subordinate to Nationall Synods, &c. And if not to shew the place where, and to name any eminent Author that ever maintained the contrary. This *Querie* is very bould and daring, yet I answere that beleevers did as soone as they were converted gather into particular Churches; as is apparent, but that they were subordinate unto Nationall Synods, &c. *sub judice lis est*; And if in many Kingdomes it might be so, *de facto*, yet whether *de jure*, and from a patterne in the Word that we desire may be proved.

Suppose this should be true, that there cannot in any Kingdome such a church be shewen for many yeeres; or at least no Writer expresseth it; if so be it can be made forth from the Word, and consonant to the Saints practise in the Apostles times. I know no such Schisme in dissenting from all mens practises to follow the cleare truth. You challenge all to shew you one eminent Writer who maintained the same; I will not go so far back into antiquity, as to bring you out a catalogue of Fathers, who though they had not a cleere light in that way, yet had many shrewd hints and notions in many things, which are practised by these you call independents. There bee many later Writers as eminent in holinesse, and without disparagement in learning to many whom you can produce for the other: (as learned Doctor *Ames* in *Medul. theolog. de Eccles.* Master *Answorth*, Master *Cotton*, with many of this age knowne unto you, to whom you will not denie eminencie in learnig) which have stood for this way; besides,

ſides, doth Maſter *Prin* think we have no more light diſcovered in theſe dayes about Church-government, then the godly had in former daies; or muſt all the Saints be regulated by former patternes, then ſhould Epiſcopacie be more followed then Presbyterie, it being as anciently practiſed, & as learnedly writ for as it.

Your ſecond *Quere* is the ſame in forme with the firſt and ſixth, and as little in it as in any; for firſt he askes whether the Law of Nature that teacheth men to ſubject themſelves to one publike form of governement in a State, doth not teach to ſubject to a National or Provincial Synod in matters of Church-government. This is anſwered in the firſt, beſide the Independents think that its as ſutable to the law of nature rectified reaſon, &c. for every particular man to have his vote in that which moſt concernes him; not to give away his reaſon to another, not to ſubject his conſcience to any but to Chriſt; reaſon, and politickes will ſhew, Maſter *Prin*, that there is a ſutableneſſe to the Law of Nature in a *Democraticall*, and *Ariſtocraticall* governement (for this way of Church-governement is made up of both theſe) as in Monarchiall, or meere *Ariſtocraticall*; beſides, Chriſt hath given to men no ſuch power over mens conſciences, as he hath to Magiſtrates over mens bodies. To let paſſe your bitter ſpeeches, ſaying that there is no example for particular Congregations, (which you call Independents) except derived from the conventicles of the Arians, Donatiſts, and other Heretickes. Leave off theſe names of Heretickes, Maſter *Prin*, you have been paid enough with that title, you may bleſſe God for theſe conventicles, in which you were remembred with teares, when others durſt not name you.

Maſter *Prins* eighth and ninth *Queres* are in ſumme all one: Thus, whether the conceſſion of one Catholike Church, the Nationall aſſemblie of the Iſralites, the Synodall aſſemblie of the Apoſtles be not an infallible proof of Nationall Churches of a common Presbitery, &c. Its anſwered negatively. And though he ſay that the Independents anſwers are but evaſions, wee ſhall judge them ſolid arguments till we ſee the contrary. The Nationall Church of the Jewes cannot be a patterne for us now, becauſe the covenant of the Goſpell is not made with any one particular Nation, as with the Jewes, but to all perſons that em-

brace the Goſpell, and beleeve in Chriſt. You have no promiſe nor propheſie of any Nation to bee holy to God but the Jewes Nation, when they ſhall be called againe.

Secondly, neither can Maſter *Prin* ſhew any Nation, every membet whereof is qualified to make up a Church; which is the body of Chriſt, unleſſe Maſter *Prin* will take in all drunkards, whore-maſters, &c. to be members of a Church; whereas the Word ſayes, they muſt be viſible Saints; and this cannot be avoided in a Nationall Church. Neither is that Aſſembly in Acts 15. which you call a Synod, any proofe for a Presbyteriall government. For firſt, I demand whether that Church had not power within it ſelfe to debate the buſineſſe, and ſettle the controverſie, ſeeing there was a great ſtrife among them about it. Secondly I demand of Maſter *Prin* whether *Paul* and *Barnabas* had not power (being Apoſtles) to determine the matter as well as the Synod of Elders?

1 Cor 1. 11. Phil 3. 1. Acts 15. 1.

Thirdly whether they went not up principally to prove the falſe Apoſtles, that were among them, lyers, for thy told them they were ſent by the Apoſtles, to make knowne that they muſt be Circumciſed. Now to give teſtimony unto this, that they came not from the Apoſtles, they ſend choſen men to Ieruſalem about it.

Verſ 24.

Fourthly, Whether this was not an occaſionall meeting, not a Synod, which is a collection of the Elders of divers Churches into a body, but only ſome of the Church choſen out and ſent to the other Church at Ieruſalem for adviſe.

Maſter *Prin* may think as ſlightly of the arguments given by the Independents (as he calls them) from this head, yet notwithſtanding his word, he muſt give them leave to judge they are ſufficient, unleſſe the authority of Maſter *Prin's* name be argument; the Scriptures quoted ſerve to fill up the margent, nothing elſe, unleſſe you open them and argue from them; for theſe texts are uſed by the contrary ſide againſt you, and as validly ſtill as yours, before more be ſhowne.

The ninth *Querie*, Whether the Independents challenging the Presbyterians to ſhew a Nationall Church in Chriſts time, be not an irrationall and unjuſt demand. Anſ. no, if the Scripture hath a forme of government for the Churches of Chriſt in after ages

to

to walke in; but to you it may ſeem irrationall, who think Church-Governement muſt be ordered according to civill State, and be caſt into that mould.

Maſter *Prin* from his *Queres* falls to his Logicke, and demandes whether a Syllogiſme framed from the former, *viz.* No Nationall Church in the Apoſtles time. *Ergo*, None ought to be now, be not as abſurde as theſe.

There was no meeting of Chriſtians in publike Churches, but in caves, corners, &c. They ought not to meet in publike Churches now, but in caves, &c.

I thought that Maſter *Prins* Logicke would have diſtinguiſhed be tweene the forme of a thing, and the circumſtance of place in the exerciſe of it, which is left to every Churches diſcretion, would this be a good argument in his logick? that becauſe the ordering of circumſtances of time and place are in the Churches power; therefore the making of new formes of governemt, is, when the congregation of men argue from the not being of a nationall conſtitution of a church in the Apoſtles dayes, to the denying of any now; they argue on this ground, being able to make it appear, that the forme of the conſtitution of the Churches in the Apoſtes time, is a patterne for all Churches to follow, and in no kinde to vary from it.

Again, he demands whether that way of arguing be not as abſurd as this?

There was no Nation, Kingdome, City, Republike, Catholike congregationall, or Parochiall Church in *Adams* younger dayes, before people were multiplied, but a family governement.

Ergo, There ought to be none but a Family governement now, no man would be ſo void of reaſon, no truly Sir, neither did the Independents think you would be ſo void of reaſon, as to father ſuch an abſurdity on them, who are are as rationall as your ſelfe.

As for civill government, let men altar it as they will, and if God will altar the government of the CHURCH, as he did from a Family into a Nation among the Jewes, and if againe from a Nation God will alter it unto a œconimicall or congregationall, we muſt yeeld.

Thirdly, Againe, whether it be not as abſurde as this,
Every man in his infancie is borne deſtitute of religion, reaſon, &c.

Therefore he ought to continue ſo when grown a man.

The Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtles time, while in her infancie was not Naionall, but ſo and ſo, (what I pray) (not Independent. How know you that, Maſter *Prin*, we will not take your word.) *Ergo*, It ought not to bee Nationall now. Here obſerve Reader.

Maſter *Prin* accoants the Church in the Apoſtles time, a poore weak Church, that had not ſo much reaſon for things then, as we have now; the Apoſtles, the ſtabliſhers of it, weake men; whereas there was more light of the Goſpell, and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt powred out then, then ever ſince; even private Chriſtians being as able to deale in the things of God, as moſt of our Schollers and Miniſters are now; yet Maſter *Prin* compares the following that patterne, the following of a childe in his infancy, that hath neither reaſon nor religion. Maſter *Prin*, follow you your perfect Church, we will follow this infant patterne, and I beſeech you, is not this argument you bring to faſten an abſurdity on them, as abſurde as this.

The Scriptures were writ in the infancie of the Church, therefore wiſer and better Scriptures may be writ now, the Church being growne up into a Nation, having ſo many reverent divines in it.

Secondly, You would needs make a Nationall Church State mor perfect, underſtanding, and ripe Church then a Congregationall; we would thinke ſo too, if we had a Word for it.

And whereas you ſay the Hiſtorie of the Acts ſhewes that as beleevers multiplied their Church-governement and Diſcipline varied, its anſwered, if you meane by varying, that things before eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles in any Church was altered, its denied, and pray ſhow the place if you meane by varied that they added rules for government as occaſion ſerved, we grant it, for as they received not the knowledge of the Goſpel at once, ſo neither of diſcipline, neither had the Churches need of all the rules at once, but as God fitted occaſions ſo he made known rules, yet ſo as at length to diſcover the whole frame of his Houſe, as he did the whole myſterie of divinity, to be as rule to all generations, afterward you ſee what your logicke is come to Maſter *Prin*, draw better conſequences next.

Your

Your tenth *Querie* is the ſame in ſumme with your ſecond, only there you ſpeake in generall, here you perticulariſe, and you aſk of the Independents whether in conſcience they are not bound to ſubmit unto the presbyteriall governement, in caſe that the Parliament and Synod ſhould eſtabliſh it; and whether it would not be a high degree of obſtinacie, ſingularity, ſelfe end, &c. to oppoſe this forme of governement.

I Anſwer. If you require this of them, and charge them ſo highly in not ſubmitting, I hope you will ſhew your authority; either you would have them ſubmit becauſe what they command is of divine inſtitution, or becauſe commanded by their authority, if in the former ſence, they muſt have eyes to ſee it as well as the Synod, or elſe their obedience will be Hypocriticall, moſt diſpleaſing to God; if in the latter, then the Popes counſell, decreeing any thing muſt out of as much conſcience be obeyed by thoſe that be under his authority, as the beſt things commanded by a Godly Synod, for *à quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia*; if becauſe they cammand, then what ever they command muſt bee done; I put the caſe to M. *Prin*, whether when he challenged all the Divines in England to make good againſt them that Epiſcopacie was not *jure Divino*, whether if the King had called a Synod and had concluded it as the moſt Divines thought; he would have given up his judgements to their votes, and ſubmit to their determination, it had been hight of arrogancie, ſelfe ends, ſchiſme in Maſter *Prin* not to do ſo, and ſo in point of Law when moſt of the Judges had given in ther judgements contrary to M. *Prin*, why did not hee ſubmit, becauſe the contrarie was cleare to him, and he had ſinned againſt his own conſcience, if he had gone backe one jot from his opinion; What if Independencie ſhould be ſet up, what if the Synod ſhould maintaine the errours of Antinomians, &c. Was Maſter *Prin* bound in conſcience to ſay as they did, to ſpeake againſt it would be Shiſme, Faction, arrogancie, &c. Maſter *Prin*, how is your ſpirit changed, what will you now ſubmit to any thing, are you become a time ſerver? have you given up your faith to other men? When Synods can ſay as they, *Acts* 15. it ſeemeth good to the Holy Ghoſt and us, to lay theſe things on you, then we will thinke we are bound in conſcience to ſubmit, elſe you muſt helpe us with new eyes.

In your eleventh *Querie* you go on in your way of bitterneſſe and aske whether that independencie be not a wombe to all ſchiſmes, Hereſies, &c. its Anſwered no, its a ſeminarie of holineſſe a nouriſher of love, away to build up unto the fulneſſe of Chriſt, your presbyteriall way is a way inſlaving mens conſciences; cruſhing the parts of theſe Saints which you call Laymen, is a way to depreſſe truth to hinder grouth in grace and Spirituall communion with Chriſt, the Saints ſhall ſoon finde it ſo.

In the laſt *Querie* Mr. *Prin* falles a jering of his brethren. He would needs father a childe on them, of presbyterians begetting; they have put a nickname on them to make them odious, and now hee asketh whether it bee not an inſolent proud name, &c. unfit for any Chriſtian to arrogate, your prisbyterians have pretty ſlights to defame theſe that are of a contrary opinion; as if one ſhould call an honeſt man thief, and aske a man whether it were not a ſhameful thing for him to be given to ſtealling. Know Maſter *Prin*; theſe men ſcorne the name, they have diſavowed it in print; the terme is more fit for you, theſe whom you ſtand for, a terme fit for your provinciall, and nationall Synods from whom there is no apealle, but to whoſe judgements all muſt ſubmit as to an Ordinance of Chriest, and though but to queſtion what is done by them is to be guilty of faction, ſchiſme, arrogancy: theſe you call independets, confeſſe that they are accountable for their actions to every neighbour Church that ſhall in the name of Chriſt require it, they ſtand not independent from others, but hold communion with all other Churches, both in the Ordinances, and asking counſell and adviſe mutually; to let your other looſe language paſſe, much with what is in the former; take ſome Chriſtian adviſe; remember you have not your hand in darkening the glory of any of the Saints; take heed of defaming a way which for ought you know may be away of Chriſt; it will coſt you many a ſigh after ward if God ſhould convince you, you know Chriſt will never owne bitterneſſe in maintaining any way though conſonant to his Word. Remember, neither you nor the Synod are infalliable, but as ſubject to errors as others; never more damnable Hereſies confirmed then by Synods (I ſpeake not this to caſt any blot on Synods, or this Synod eſpecially in which there are many holy and learned men) but to ſhew that a man is not bound in

[s] Se M Simpſons Anatomie, anatomiſed. Concil. Trent

in conſcience to follow their decrees upon penalty of ſin, arrogancie, &c. And not to ſeek the leaſt exemption from what they determine whoſe decrees may be ſubject to as great errours as any. Oh that a ſpirit of love were maintained among theſe which are brethren, though men differ in judgemen, muſt they needs differ in affection! Maſter *Prin* if you will needs be buſie in this controverſie leave off your *Queres* for wee will deny them all; ſtate your queſtion; ſet forth your arguments, open the Scriptures you quote to fill up the margent, be as breefe as may be; call in your paſſion and conſider, and doubt not of an anſwer to what you ſhall modeſtly ſet forth.

FINIS.

Mercurius Britannicus
John ord
Coronation 1027